



# HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

*ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District*

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

---

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

VOICE 410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3042

## December Minutes

Thursday, December 1, 2016; 6:30 p.m.

---

The eleventh meeting for the year 2016 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, October 20, 2016 in the Columbia/Ellicott City Room located 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Erica Zoren, Drew Roth, Secretary  
Bruno Reich

Staff present: Samantha Holmes, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Yvette Zhou

---

### PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 16-24c – 3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City
2. 16-68c – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 16-102 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 16-103 – 8386 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
5. 16-104 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 16-105 – Parking Lot E, Ellicott City

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **16-24c – 3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Susan Hade

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1905. The Applicant was pre-approved in May 2016 to make repairs to the front porch. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$9,004.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,251.00 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts and invoices add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**16-68c – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit approval

Applicant: Jackie Everett

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant was pre-approved on September 15, 2016 to replace the side doors that were destroyed by the July 30 flood. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$1,064.59 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$266.15 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts and invoices add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**16-102 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval to install library stand.

Applicant: Bridget Graham

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. The building dates to 1940. The Applicant proposes to install a 'Little Free Library' stand on the Howard County Welcome Center property. The library stand will be installed on the back lawn of the Welcome Center Property, along Hamilton Street, where a parking pay station was previously located. The existing foundation from the pay station is still in place and will be utilized for the library stand.

The library stand is a square box that is 22 inches wide by 22.5 inches tall by 18.5 inches deep made of wood, with a pitched roof. There is a door on the front of the box with a Plexiglas window opening and a handle for the door to swing open. The library box will be installed on a 4x4 post that will be 60 inches tall. The post will remain unpainted. The door has been painted a Kelly green, the sides are purple and the roof is a mixture of orange/reds/pinks to look like a sunset. The roof has a plaque that says "Little Free Library". The entire structure should be no higher than 5.5 feet.

This project is in partnership with three Girl Scout Troops, who built the library and will be responsible for keeping it stocked with books. Howard



**Figure 1 - Proposed 'Little Free Library' to be installed**

County Tourism & Promotion will assist in keeping the library stand stocked with books in good condition.

**Staff Comments:** The proposed library stand will be a minor structure added to the site, but will be located in a highly visible location. The Guidelines (Chapter 10.C, page 76) do not specifically address items such as these, but do offer recommendations for street furniture, such as “select street furniture that reinforces Ellicott City’s identity as a historic district” and recommends against, “selecting new items of street furniture without considering whether the design is appropriate for the historic district and consistent with existing similar items.”



Figure 2 - Proposed location of installation

The library stand complies with Chapter 10.C recommendations, “use street furniture that is simple in design and constructed of traditional materials such as wood and dark metal.” The proposed library stand will be made from wood, although it has been painted. The paint colors do not comply with Chapter 6.N of the Guidelines, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The colors used are not compatible with the colors used in the district. The Guidelines also specifically recommend against, “using primary colors, bright orange, bright purple and grass green. These are not historically appropriate and generally will not blend with the district’s architecture” and “using too many colors. This may detract from the architectural design of the building.” There are about four to five different colors used on the library stand and all are bright colors. The colors do not comply with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends the library stand be painted using more traditional colors that would be seen on historic buildings, which would enrich the streetscape, as shown in Figures 3 and 4 below. The library stand could also be painted to look like the historic Firehouse Museum on Church Road and Main Street, shown in Figure 5. The repainting could be used as an educational exercise for the Girl Scouts to learn about historic districts and why they are important.



Figure 3 - Example of a library stand



Figure 4 - Example of a library stand



Figure 5 - Historic firehouse to use as inspiration for proposed library stand

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of the library stand, contingent upon using an alternate color scheme with historically appropriate colors. Staff recommends the color scheme be subject to Staff approval, with guidance provided by the Commission.

**Testimony:** Mr. Taylor corrected a typo for the record found in the Staff comments. The word “not” was excluded from the text quoting the Guidelines that should read: “These [primary colors] are not historically appropriate and generally will not blend with the district’s architecture”. Mr. Shad swore in Bridget Graham. Mr. Shad asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments or application. Ms. Graham said she agreed with Staff suggestions and stated this is a big opportunity for the Girl Scout troop she is working with to learn about historic Ellicott City. Mr. Reich asked if Staff should approve the colors of the library. Ms. Holmes asked if Mr. Reich can provide guidance on which color schemes are appropriate. The Commission discussed primary colors not being appropriate and found that mimicking the Firehouse Museum was a great approach. Ms. Tennor said it would be a good idea if there was a sign or plaque to identify the library as a Girl Scout project. Ms. Graham said the library will be branded with “Little Free Library” plaque. Mr. Shad asked about the safety of the designated installation location as it seemed to be adjacent to the busy sidewalk and crosswalk to Parking Lot D. Ms. Graham said she was not concerned since it was the same designated area as the parking pay station that the previous Historic Preservation Commission had approved, making it an ideal location for pedestrians. Mr. Reich asked if the books are given out free. Ms. Graham said it will be free based on a community trade system with no tracking, check out, or return process.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to approve as submitted and that the colors and recognition plaque should be approved by Staff. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **16-103 – 8386 Court Avenue, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Daniela Puiu

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1870. The house has been neglected for many years and the Applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations:

- 1) Doors – The existing front door is a 1 lite over 2 vertical panel door and is 32 inches wide by 80 inches tall. The Applicant proposes to replace this door with a new wood door in the same style. The galvanized storm door will be replaced with a white full lite self-storing glass/screen storm door with a bottom panel. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.



**Figure 6 - Front of house**



2) Windows – The existing windows on the house are all wood 2:2. The windows appear in very poor condition and the photos submitted shown rot in the windows.

3) Siding – The existing siding is asbestos siding. The Applicant proposes to replace any missing asbestos shingles with GAF's fiber cement shingle that matches old asbestos shingles.

4) Painting – The current colors on the house are white asbestos siding and windows and a blue porch floor and shutters. The application states that the Applicant proposes to use light beige or light blue but has not indicated on which building features the colors would be used. Staff asked the Applicant to finalize the colors and the Applicant stated they like Flagstaff Green or Teton Blue – these colors are located on the right hand lower side of the paint chips provided. The porch will have white railings and posts and a gray floor.



Figure 7 - Birds eye view of house

5) Roof – The existing roof is a galvanized metal roof. The Applicant proposes to replace the standing seam galvanized metal roof (could be galvanized iron or steel – exact material unknown) with an inverted v seam steel roof.

6) Shutters – The Applicant proposes to restore and paint 10 existing wood shutters on the front of the house. Four of the shutters are 80"x15" and six are 60"x15". There are also two shutters on the south west side of the house that were not addressed. Via email the Applicant stated, "There are 5 windows with missing shutters, we intend to replace them with the same style and paint them. In case the restoration doesn't look good, we can replace them for the same materials and style. The existing shutters are real shutters and we intend to keep the same style. Option B would be to replace all the shutters and install vinyl shutters from Home Depot."

7) Gutters – The majority of the house does not have any gutters or downspouts. There are gutters located around the porch and downspouts tied in on the front porch columns and front corners of the house. The gutters are hooked up into piping that appears to go into the ground, but it is unclear where the water is being diverted. The Applicant proposes to install new white aluminum gutters and white aluminum downspouts.

8) Driveway – There is an existing 20 foot by 17 foot broken asphalt driveway on the south west side of the house. The Applicant proposes to expand the driveway in concrete to be 30x40 feet wide to accommodate two cars.

9) Front Porch – The front porch is a wood porch with an "x" pattern railing and bracketed scrolls in the corners of each post. The porch roof is a standing seam metal roof to match the rest of the house. The Applicant proposes to "replace the whole front porch due to rotten wood and severe damage all over. Existing material is wood, color is white railings and posts and grey floors." The Applicant states that they are planning to keep the same colors, styles and patterns.

- 10) Rear Addition- The rear addition the Applicant refers to was an open air porch that the previous owner started to enclose, although the work was never finished or done correctly. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing addition and build a deck or rear porch in that location. The material for the deck would be pressure treated wood.



Figure 8 -Southwest side of house facing driveway



Figure 9 - Rear of house

**Staff Comments:** The application generally complies with Chapter 6 recommendations as the goal is to repair the damaged building.

- 1) Doors – The only doors identified in this application are a front door, front storm door and side basement door. If there are any other doors on the building, such as a rear door, they are not being approved as this time.

**Front doors** - The front door does not appear to be damaged beyond repair. It is located under a porch and was covered with a storm door so it should not be in so poor of a condition that repair would not be possible. Staff requested additional photographs showing damage and the Applicant has submitted the photos shown in Figures 10-12 below. Staff recommends denial of replacement front door and recommends the door be repaired and tax credit pre-approval for the work.



Figure 10 - Front door



Figure 11 - Front door



Figure 12 - Front door

**Side basement door** - The wood side door on the south west side of the house was not mentioned in application, so Staff followed up through email. The Applicant stated the door will be replaced with the same material and style. The paint color needs to be determined. See Figure 13. The bottom of the door does appear to be deteriorated, but other deterioration is not overly evident. The door is not of a historic style, and Staff has no objection to installing a replacement door to be made of wood and of the same design and style, which is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.H of the Guidelines, "replace entrance features with materials that exactly match the existing materials." Staff recommends Approval of the



Figure 13 – South west wood side door

replacement of the side basement door and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

- 2) Windows – Chapter 6.H of the Guidelines recommends maintaining and repairing original windows, but that when repair is not possible, “replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing.” The photos submitted show a lot of rot in the existing windows, many of which appear beyond repair. The proposed windows are 2:2 wood windows, to match the existing windows. Staff recommends Approval of the replacement windows, except for the windows on the front façade. The first floor porch windows are quite large and set above a two panel insert and appear in good condition. The paint has completely sealed the windows and the windows are covered by the porch. The second floor windows should also be repaired if possible, so that the front façade remains historically intact. Otherwise, Staff has no objection with the remainder of the windows being replaced so that the building has one uniform style of window. The size of the replacement windows should comply with the Guidelines referenced above – the profile of the muntins should match and all windows should be sized to their opening, rather than having any openings filled in to fit a stock sized window. Staff recommends approval and tax credit pre-approval for the in-kind replacement of the existing wood windows with new wood windows, but that the front façade windows should be repaired. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the repair of the front façade windows.



Figure 14 - Front porch window

- 3) Siding – The repair of the broken and missing asbestos siding with the GAF product (which is the only product available to repair asbestos with) would be considered Routine Maintenance, per Chapter 6.D, “replacing deteriorated siding or shingles with materials that exactly match the existing siding or shingles and do not cover or alter details such as cornerboards, door and window trim and cornices.” The use of the GAF shingle will be limited to deteriorated or missing asbestos shingles. Staff recommends approval of using the GAF shingle and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 4) Painting – The Applicant has not indicated what element of the house the proposed color will be used on, such as the siding vs. the shutters. If the siding is painted one of the proposed colors, then a color is still needed for the shutters. The porch will remain its current color scheme of white railings and posts with a gray floor. Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommends, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the color used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details such as doors or trim.” The neighboring building is currently undergoing renovation and the siding has been painted Benjamin Moore Coventry Gray and the shutters are Benjamin Moore Kendall Charcoal.





Figure 15 - Neighboring house new paint scheme

- 5) Roof - Staff recommends the Applicant provide additional documentation of the exterior of the roof that shows the need for replacement. Metal roofs should be painted to protect the life of the roof. This roof should be painted, which may assist with any issues, otherwise metal roofs have a long life expectancy and the main roof does not appear to be in need of replacement. The rear addition roof can be seen in aerial photography and does appear to be in poor condition, requiring replacement. The proposed inverted v seam is not a historically correct roofing type. The existing roof is a standing seam metal roof, which is a historic roofing style. Staff recommends Denial of replacement with the inverted V seam roof and recommends the Applicant return to the Commission when they have identified where to purchase a standing seam metal roof, which would be eligible for the tax credit. These recommendations comply with Chapter 6.E of the Guidelines, “replace historic roof materials only when necessary due to extensive deterioration; use replacement material that matches or is similar to the original.” The proposed type is not similar to the original and stands out as a modern roofing material.

- 6) Shutters – The repair and painting of the shutters and in-kind replacement is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.I, which states that Routine Maintenance includes, “maintaining and repairing shutters or blinds” and “installing new



Figure 16 - Condition of shutters

shutters or blinds that exactly match the existing one.” The Applicant stated the missing shutters have a piece of the metal hinges still on the siding to show that shutters previously existed. Chapter 6.I recommends, “install shutters or blinds of painted wood. Shutters or blinds should be correctly sized for the window and operable, or at least appear operable with hinges and holdbacks appropriate to the period of initial construction.” Any new shutters should comply with these Guidelines. Staff is unsure if all of the shutters are repairable, in which case Staff recommends they be replaced in-kind with new shutters, to comply with the Guidelines. Staff recommends Approval of repairing the existing shutters or the in-kind replacement with operable, wood shutters if needed, to match the existing for tax credit pre-approval. Staff recommends the front porch shutters be repaired as proposed and not replaced as the panel detail on the shutters matches up perfectly with the panel detail on the window. Staff recommends denial of vinyl shutters, which do not comply with the Guidelines.

- 7) Gutters - The Applicant has not indicated whether the gutters will be half round or K style. Staff recommends half round gutters be used, which are more historically appropriate as K style gutters are a post war style. The existing gutters around the porch are half round style. The Applicant has also not indicated where the downspouts will be located, but there are existing downspouts on the front corners of the house. The join between these two systems is somewhat clunky and should be refined when new gutters and downspouts are added. Pending location and style, the use of gutters complies with Chapter 6.E recommendations, “use gutters and downspouts of painted metal or prefinished aluminum in a color consistent with the building’s exterior walls or trim. Staff recommends the downspouts be located on the side corners of the house, as recommend by Chapter 6.E of the Guidelines, “Locate downspouts along natural vertical lines and corners of the building.”



Figure 17 - Existing gutters and downspouts

- 8) Driveway - The parcel is split zoned Historic Office (HO) and Historic Commercial (HC) and as such is exempt from parking requirements. Additionally, aerial photography from 2009 shows two cars fitting side by side on the pad. The size of the existing parking pad is similar in size to the neighboring pad at 8382 and aerial photography shows two cars in this location in 2006. Chapter 9.D of the Guidelines recommends, “where needed, install new residential driveways that are narrow (one lane) and follow the contours of the site to minimize the need for clearing and grading. If possible, locate off-street parking spaces in side or rear yards.” The existing parking pad is already large enough to accommodate two cars side by side; further enlarging the pad does not comply with the recommendations in the Guidelines. Chapter 9.D also recommends against “poured concrete...in locations visible from a public way or neighboring property.” The existing parking pad is highly visible from the public way, but is already made of asphalt. Staff recommends repaving in asphalt, which is the prominent driveway material in the vicinity.





Figure 18 - 2009



Figure 19 - 2006



Figure 20 - Existing driveway

- 9) Front porch - Staff does not find enough information has been submitted regarding the rebuilding of the front porch, which is a character defining element of this building. Staff recommends the Applicant return at a later date with architectural elevations that show what the porch will look like and that the front porch be withdrawn for approval at this time.



Figure 21 - Front porch railing



Figure 22 - Front porch decorative brackets



Figure 23 - Front porch piers

- 10) Rear addition - Staff finds the construction of a deck is not appropriate, given that records indicate that a porch previously existed in this location. Likewise pressure treated wood is not an appropriate material for a rear porch. Staff does not find that enough information has been submitted regarding this item and recommends the Applicant return at a later date with architectural elevations that show what the rear deck or porch will look like and that the rear addition alterations be withdrawn for approval at this time.



Figure 24 - Stone foundation under rear addition



Figure 25 - Wood lap siding on rear addition

- 11) Additional Comments – The chimney was not listed as a repair item, but appears to be in need of repointing, replacement bricks and a new chimney crown and cap. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval to repoint the chimney, matching the existing mortar; for the replacement of brick courses as needed, to match the existing brick, and for any other repair work, such as a new crown and cap, needed to make the chimney safe. The Applicant is not obligated to make these repairs, but may proceed if the work is pre-approved. Staff recommends the pre-approval be contingent upon a detailed scope of work, which complies with the above conditions, from a chimney/masonry professional. The repair of the chimney to match the existing brick and mortar would comply with Chapter 6.C recommendations for masonry. Wood trim around the house was not specifically mentioned as a repair item, but there is deterioration of the trim that needs to be repaired. Staff recommends all trim be repaired and any rotten wood be replaced in-kind with wood, painted white to match the existing. This work would be Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.K, “maintaining and repairing cornices and ornamentation” and “replacing cornice details and ornamentation with materials that exactly match the existing materials.” However, this work does require approval for tax credits.



Figure 26 - Condition of chimney





Figure 27 - Trim to be repaired

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

- 1) Denial of replacement of the front door and recommends the door be repaired and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 2) Approval of the replacement of the side basement door and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 3) Approval and tax credit pre-approval for the in-kind replacement of the existing wood windows with new wood windows, except for the front façade windows which should be repaired. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the repair of the front façade windows and for the remainder of the windows to be replaced.
- 4) Approval of using the GAF shingle and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 5) Approval of using the Teton Blue Behr color, but the other colors still need to be determined. Placement of the Teton Blue (siding vs. shutters needs to be determined).
- 6) Denial of replacement with the inverted v seam roof.
- 7) Approval of repairing the existing shutters or the in-kind replacement with operable, wood shutters if needed, to match the existing for tax credit pre-approval. Staff recommends the front porch shutters be repaired as proposed and not replaced as the panel detail on the shutters matches up perfectly with the panel detail on the window. Staff recommends denial of vinyl shutters, which do not comply with the Guidelines.
- 8) Approval of installing half round white aluminum gutters, pending appropriate locations being identified. Tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 9) Denial of driveway expansion. Approval of repaving in asphalt, to match the existing.
- 10) Tax credit pre-approval to repoint the chimney, matching the existing mortar and for any other repair work needed to make the chimney safe.
- 11) Tax credit pre-approval to repair or replace rotten wood trim, with new wood trim to match the existing in color and profile.
- 12) Staff recommends the Applicant withdraw the request to rebuild the front porch and make alteration/demolish the rear addition and resubmit at a later date when more information is available.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received. Funding is available on a first come-first serve basis and pre-approvals expire after 6 months as explained in the Façade Improvement Program Information.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Reinaldo Velazquez who is the Applicant's husband. Mr. Shad asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments application.

1a. **Front Door:** Mr. Velazquez said he wants to replace the door instead of repairing it to match the brand new interior of the house. Mr. Velazquez said his contractor ensured him the new door will match the existing door. Mr. Velazquez said he will restore the door if the Commission recommends restoration. Ms. Tennor said if the existing door can be repaired and restored it would be preferred over a new door. Ms. Zoren asked if the existing door has single paned glass. Mr. Velazquez said yes. Mr. Velazquez said his contractor can restore the existing door but it may not be up to current energy efficiency standards. Ms. Zoren said she would approve a new door since historic homes have air draft leaking issues.

1b. **Side basement door:** Mr. Velazquez agreed with the Staff recommendations and said he will replace the door in-kind with a wood door.

2. **Windows:** Mr. Velazquez said that he wants to replace all of the windows because of their poor condition and said his contractors can replicate the new windows to match the existing. Ms. Holmes asked if the contractors can restore the first floor porch windows with the panels because they did not appear to be in poor condition. Mr. Velazquez said yes or he can just replace the panel. Ms. Tennor asked if the new window muntins and panels will be the same. Mr. Velazquez said everything will be the same except it will be double paned glass for energy efficiency. Ms. Tennor asked if the new window muntins will be snap on or true divided light. Mr. Velazquez said he was not sure and referred the Commission to view the specifications he provided at the start of the meeting. Mr. Reich said the specifications indicated the muntins are glued on and the products are off the shelf. He advised Mr. Velazquez to go to a qualified manufacturer who can duplicate the existing windows by matching the wood windows and frames with a true divided light. Ms. Tennor asked if Mr. Velazquez is open to matching the exact window in every detail as existing. Mr. Velazquez said yes and if he cannot, he will return to the next Historic Preservation Commission meeting for more advice.

3. **Siding:** Mr. Velazquez stated he wanted to use the GAF fiber cement that looks like asbestos siding. Mr. Reich said the house was built in the 1870s with clapboard siding not asbestos. He said it would be more historically accurate to remove the asbestos siding and reuse the wood siding. Mr. Velazquez was concerned about the cost of removing all the asbestos siding and asked if it was possible to get a wood siding to match the existing. Ms. Burgess said from a historical aspect, the original wood or wood replacement is more appropriate than the fiber cement board. Mr. Reich asked if either one is allowable. Ms. Holmes said both solutions of repair are allowed; restoring the original wood siding under the asbestos or replacing missing asbestos shingles with the GAF product to match the existing asbestos siding. Mr. Taylor said the Guidelines generally allow replacement of existing materials. Ms. Holmes said the State also offers a 20% income tax credit for the rehabilitation of the building. She said Mr. Velazquez would need to contact the Maryland Historical Trust for more details about the program since it is managed by the State. Mr. Reich said the clapboard siding would be more historically accurate

instead of painted fiber cement siding. Mr. Reich said specialty stores such as John S. Wilson Lumber, Reisterstown Lumber or TW Perry can offer customized products. Ms. Tennor asked if Mr. Velazquez is willing to obtain two estimates, one for replacing the asbestos siding and the other for removing the asbestos and restoring the original clapboard siding. Mr. Velazquez agreed.

**4. Painting:** Mr. Velazquez said he narrowed the paint colors for the house to Behr Flagstaff Green or Heron Blue. Mr. Velazquez is concerned that the Heron Blue color would be identical to the house next door. Ms. Holmes said the house next door looks to be a greener gray when she visited the site. She explained that Mr. Velazquez was not limited to these two colors but explained that he had not picked any colors for his application when she asked him to choose colors. Ms. Zoren asked for the shutter color. Mr. Velazquez said they would be white and the preferred siding color would Flagstaff Green. He said all trim and posts would be white. Ms. Zoren said historically it is uncommon for medium color siding to be used with a white shutter. She said the shutter is usually darker than the siding color. Mr. Velazquez said the original shutter color was green and he can choose a darker green for the siding. Ms. Zoren recommended Teton Blue for shutters and #2 Canyon Wind for the siding based on the color palettes Mr. Velazquez provided. Ms. Burgess asked Mr. Velazquez to identify the two colors this evening for the Commission to approve. Mr. Velazquez said he will return to the Commission with his final paint colors later. Mr. Taylor said the Commission can allow Staff to approve paint colors later. Ms. Zoren is fine with Staff approval on colors as long as the siding color is lighter than the shutters.

**5. Roof:** Mr. Velazquez said the proposed new roof replacement will be a standard historic seam galvanized roof. Mr. Velazquez said the contractor, Fichtner Services, reroofed another historic property in Ellicott City. Ms. Holmes asked for the property address where contractor recently completed work. Mr. Velazquez said it was a porch roof located on Main Street. Ms. Zoren asked if it will be hand seamed and if the new roof will have the same profile and width. Mr. Velazquez said yes. Ms. Tennor asked if the roof will have a new membrane. Mr. Velazquez said the entire roof will be new as he needs to ensure there are no water leaks that will damage his new interior construction. Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Velazquez to confirm the exact address of the building the contractor previously worked on. Mr. Velazquez said he will. Ms. Holmes asked if the new roof will be painted. Mr. Velazquez said he was open to suggestions. Ms. Holmes recommended Mr. Velazquez contact some historic resources: Rob Brennan, the Ellicott City Partnership Design Committee Chair who may be the person whose roof Fitchner recently replaced, as well as Renee Novak, who works for Preservation Maryland and may be able to make some recommendations. Ms. Holmes will forward their contact details to Mr. Velazquez. Mr. Taylor said if Mr. Velazquez will be replacing in-kind, then Staff could approve the colors. Mr. Burgess was concerned with the pending approval of several items. Mr. Taylor clarified if there is an existing hand seamed roof now, Mr. Velazquez can replace it with in-kind materials that Staff can confirm. Ms. Holmes asked if the roof will be painted. Mr. Taylor said the existing roof seems to be painted. Ms. Tennor said the current roof is currently a light color and should remain light. Mr. Velazquez will have the contractor investigate what the original color is.

Mr. Shad swore in Sybil Buckwalter, the realtor for Mr. Velazquez.

**6. Shutters:** Mr. Velazquez said he will try to restore the existing shutters and will customize new wood shutters to match the existing for those that are missing. Mr. Velazquez asked if the shutters need to be operable or just for aesthetics. Ms. Tennor asked if the current shutters are operable. Mr. Velazquez said yes. Ms. Buckwalter said many have rusted through but they were originally made to work. Ms. Holmes said the shutters on the front porch were working when she visited the property. Ms. Tennor said the shutters should be operable. Ms. Zoren asked if the shutters need to operate or if they could have hardware like the shutter dogs to look historically correct. Ms. Holmes stated that if the shutters

are currently operable it would make sense for them to remain so at this time. Mr. Velazquez said his contractors can make them operable and the paint color will be determined.

**7. Gutters:** Mr. Velazquez said the gutters will be white half round in the front and back and located on the areas shown on the submitted drawings. Ms. Holmes asked where the water is currently draining that is directed underneath the porch. Mr. Velazquez was unsure. Ms. Tennor asked if the new gutters will have splash blocks instead of the underground draining system. Mr. Velazquez said he was open to suggestions. Ms. Zoren said if the existing gutter just drained the water underground and not away from the house, the water was doing more damage to foundation. Ms. Buckwalter said the gutter output will be investigated.

**8. Driveway:** Mr. Velazquez plans to market the house as both residential and commercial for the option to use as professional offices. He said the existing driveway is 20 feet x 17 feet and narrowly fits two cars. Mr. Velazquez would like to expand the driveway about 13 feet toward the backyard and 10 feet on the right toward the house to make it into a 30x40 driveway to accommodate business parking. Ms. Tennor asked how many cars could park on the expanded driveway. Ms. Burgess said 30x40 allows six cars. Ms. Zoren said a typical parking spot is 9x18, 10x20, or 8x18. Ms. Buckwalter said the standard garage is 20x20 and the proposed expansion would accommodate the office staff and visitor parking.

Ms. Holmes pointed out Chapter 9.D of the Guidelines recommends “where needed install new residential driveway that are narrow one lane and follow the contours of the site to minimize need for clearing and grading.” She said the proposed driveway expansion would be against the Guidelines. Ms. Burgess said Lot E, in front of the property, is often full but behind the property is Lot F, which has about one hundred spaces. Ms. Zoren asked if the District has requirements for grasscrete or asphalt for extended driveways. Ms. Holmes said grasscrete was used as the solution for a previously built driveway that was in violation. Ms. Burgess said the past solutions have not been maintained well. Ms. Buckwalter asked for clarification of the grass grid product. Ms. Zoren described how grass is grown between a patterned concrete or PVC grid to allow a pervious surface to absorb water run-off. Ms. Burgess said from a distance the surface appears to be grass but it allows for the weight of cars to park on it. Ms. Burgess said that plowing snow on them may be difficult. Ms. Buckwalter said there is another product called pervious asphalt. Ms. Zoren said that asphalt has maintenance issues and it still appears to be asphalt from a distance.

Mr. Reich asked if the property will be more like the professional offices or residential home. Ms. Buckwalter said it was previously a lawyer’s office. Ms. Burgess said the property next to the Applicant’s is renovated for residential use and the two properties up the street are also residential. Mr. Reich said the amount of impervious area the Applicant wants to cover is not significant and Mr. Reich is unsure if saving 10 feet of paving will make a difference in the appearance. Ms. Holmes said when the size of the parking pad is compared to the footprint of the house, it is a concern that the parking is larger than the footprint. Mr. Taylor said the Guidelines for outbuildings recommend they be scaled appropriately in comparison to the historic structure and set away from the historic structure. Ms. Tennor said she is concerned about the paving so close to the house with a narrow strip of grass. Ms. Buckwalter said there are currently bumpers on the side of the driveway making it very narrow for cars to enter and widening is needed. Ms. Holmes said the bumpers or curbs could be removed and the size of the pad could be left as is. Ms. Holmes confirmed there is public parking lot in front of the house and a public pathway that connects to another parking lot. Ms. Holmes said to deviate from the Guidelines would set a precedent that is not appropriate for the Historic District. Mr. Roth said the Guidelines said “new residential” but the Applicant’s property will be used as a commercial space and asked if there were commercial guidelines. Ms. Holmes said most commercial properties do not have driveways and this could be used as a residential house with neighboring houses. Mr. Taylor cited the Judges Bench



example where the Commission allowed a slight expansion of the driveway but still in keeping with the narrow confines of typical parking throughout the District. The driveway was built larger than it was authorized. When it came back to Historic Preservation Commission for retroactive approval, the Commission denied it and required for the reduction to the driveway size that was authorized.

Mr. Taylor read from Chapter 10 of the Guidelines, Off-Street Parking: "Privately owned parking lots in Ellicott City are generally small areas adjacent to a public street. Most of the parking for commercial or institutional uses has traditionally been provided on the street or in recent years in larger public parking lots. The visibility of these larger parking lots varies, those located in rear of Main Street commercial buildings are effectively screened from Main Street but are highly visible from hillsides overlooking Main Street. Others such as the parking space adjacent to Maryland Avenue and Court House parking lot are highly visible from the adjacent public street but have minimal visibility from other parts of the district. The need for the large expansive paving associated with parking lots is a recent development. Within the historic district, paved areas should be no larger than necessary and landscaped areas should be used to help these necessary modern amenities blend better with historic Ellicott City. Plantings can be used to buffer views of parking areas, break up large expanses of paving and provide shade. New parking lots should be designed to minimize changes to historic streetscapes or to the settling of historic buildings."

Mr. Roth said the Guideline is reasonable for preserving the historic streetscape regardless of that the building's commercial use, by not allowing the parking expansion.

**9. Front Porch:** Mr. Velazquez said there are lots of damaged and missing railings. He preferred to replace them. Mr. Velazquez would like to use a yellow pine pressure treated wood to replace the decking that can be stained to look like the existing wood. He is open to suggestions. Ms. Buckwalter said pressure treated wood is the best option against rotting and wear. Ms. Tennor said usually pressure treated yellow pine cannot be stained right away. Mr. Velazquez said after a couple of weeks, it can be stained. Ms. Burgess said it is uncertain if the Commission has ever approved pressure treated wood before, it is usually a hardwood that is tongue and groove. Ms. Tennor asked if the existing decking is painted. Ms. Holmes said the existing floor is a blue-gray the posts, railings and decorative brackets are white. Mr. Velazquez prefers all the trim to be white. Mr. Roth said as long as Mr. Velazquez is doing a replacement in-kind the colors details could be up to Staff to approve. Ms. Holmes said there are a lot of the details on the porch that should be documented in order to recreate it accurately. Ms. Tennor asked if the lattice between the piers of the porch will be replaced. Mr. Velazquez said yes he would like to replace them because of the bad condition they are in and some are uneven. Ms. Zoren asked if all the brackets are currently there. Mr. Velazquez said some are missing but he has a master carpenter who can recreate to match the original. Ms. Holmes said overall there is a lot of replacement instead of restoration taking place with this application, which is of concern. Mr. Roth said Mr. Velazquez will need to seek approval later if replacement is not going to be in-kind, but prior to any alterations taking place.

**10. Rear addition:** Mr. Velazquez said the rear addition has a lot of rotten wood. He said there is plywood on the siding and the decking that is unstable. Mr. Velazquez proposed to build a porch with a roof and or a deck using pressure treated wood. Ms. Holmes said the rear porch area is visible from the public pathway to the parking lot. Ms. Tennor said the rear doesn't have asbestos shingle. Mr. Velazquez said he will match the fiber cement siding matching the front of the house. Ms. Holmes said there are three proposed elevations that Mr. Velazquez handed out that night. She stated that two have a center passage and the third one has a right side passage. Ms. Holmes said that Option One has two doors while Options Two and Three only have the existing door. Mr. Velazquez said there is plywood in between the two windows in the back and it is unknown what is there, but it has no door and only has a wall inside. Mr. Velazquez would like to add a window next to the existing windows for more light. Ms. Holmes asked which elevation is preferred. Ms. Buckwalter said Options Two or Three would allow for

the new window. Mr. Reich asked if the details will match the front porch. Ms. Buckwalter said the details were from a neighboring property and seemed to be historically accurate. Ms. Zoren said the new window would need to be centered or it would look odd and be off-center with the existing second floor windows. Mr. Velazquez said the window can remain the same not to cause off-center issue. Ms. Zoren said the Guidelines advised against making exterior opening unless documentation can be provided showing that opening existed prior. Mr. Velazquez was ok not adding the third window but would need a window on the side in Option Three. Mr. Velazquez clarified to the Commission that one of the windows is covered by the plywood. Ms. Tennor said Option Two shows a shortened window. Mr. Velazquez said a countertop sink will be installed on the inside which is why the window needs to be smaller. Ms. Buckwalter said the bottom of the window needs to be 42 inches above the floor. The Commission recommended Option One as the best option or for the Applicant and said the Applicant would need to return back to the Commission with more details. Mr. Roth referred to Figure 25, the exterior door on the rear of the house. Ms. Holmes said it is a nine lite over two panel and the Applicant can replace it in kind. Ms. Tennor asked if the door needs to be replaced. Mr. Velazquez said from what it looks like, it needs to be replaced. He prefers to replace it rather than restore. Ms. Holmes said the door does not look historic. Mr. Taylor asked the Applicant to return to the Commission with the rear porch design. Ms. Buckwalter said yes she is willing to continue it to the next meeting with sample materials, design and dimensions. Mr. Velazquez asked if he needs to submit an application to build a retaining walls, fence and tree removal. Ms. Holmes said yes, Mr. Velazquez would need to submit new applications and return to the Commission.

11. **Chimneys:** Mr. Velazquez said there are three chimneys. One was for a fireplace no longer there, and he would like to redo it. Mr. Velazquez said he plans to get rid the other two or keep them for cosmetic purposes in keeping Guidelines. Ms. Holmes said the Guidelines would be against removal of the chimneys. Mr. Taylor said per the Staff report, the chimney and trim repairs were not included in request for tax credit. Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Velazquez if he would like to amend the application to include a request for tax credit pre-approval for the chimney and trim repair. Mr. Velazquez said yes.

#### **Tax Credit Pre-Approval and Façade Improvement Program**

Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Velazquez to provide before and after photos, including all receipts and cancelled checks when he returns for final tax credit. Ms. Holmes said the quotes should be submitted for work to the front of the building for Façade Improvement Program. The remaining tax credit work does not require quotes, only invoices, which should be itemized to reflect the items pre-approved. Ms. Holmes stated that the Maryland Historical Trust has to approve repairs for the Façade Improvement Program and may not sign off on some of the replacement items. Mr. Taylor said the contractors should be MHIC licensed.

#### **Motion:**

1. **Door:** Mr. Roth moved to approve repair or replacement in-kind with tax credit pre-approval. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Roth moved to approve replacement in-kind of the side basement door with tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

2. **Windows:** Mr. Roth moved to approve the in-kind replacement or repair of the existing wood windows with new wood windows except for the front first floor front windows under the porch which should be repaired with tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

3. **Siding:** Mr. Reich moved to approve the repair of the existing asphalt shingle siding with GAF fiber cement shingle siding or removing the asbestos shingle siding and restoring the existing wood lap siding below it. Also approve repair of wood siding on the rear of the house or covering the rear of the house with matching GAF fiber cement shingles with tax credit approval. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
4. **Paint Colors:** Mr. Roth moved to approve repainting the house with colors to be approved by Staff with contingency that shutters need to be darker than the base wall color for tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
5. **Roof:** Mr. Roth moved to deny replacement of existing roof with inverted V seam roof but approve replacement in-kind of the roof with paint colors to be approved by Staff for tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
6. **Shutters:** Mr. Roth moved to approve either the repair of existing shutters or the in-kind replacement of existing shutters with operable wood shutters, if needed, to match the existing and the addition of new shutters where they are missing to match the existing for tax credit pre-approval. Denial of vinyl shutters. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
7. **Gutters:** Mr. Roth moved to approve installing half round white aluminum gutters and downspouts with tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
8. **Driveway:** Mr. Roth moved to deny the driveway expansion and approve installation of a 20x20 foot parking pad in asphalt, in the location of the existing pad with removal of concrete curbs. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
9. **Chimneys:** Mr. Roth moved to pre-approve tax credits for repointing all chimneys, matching the existing mortar, and for any other repair work needed to make the chimney safe with photographic documentation of current chimneys to be provided to the Staff. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
10. **Wood trim:** Mr. Roth moved to approve the repair or replacement of rotted wood trim in-kind with new wood trim to match the existing and color and profile referring to trim and fascia, not including any aspects of the porch, for tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
11. **Front Porch:** Mr. Roth moved to approve the repair or replacement of all its features in-kind, except the decking which may be replaced with tongue and groove pressure treated yellow pine, dimensions to be approved by Staff for tax credit approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
12. **Rear Porch:** Mr. Roth moved to approve the replacement of the existing rear first floor left side window with a window the same width as the existing, but shorter to accommodate an interior kitchen counter. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**16-104 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Tax credit pre-approval for structural repairs.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. This building sustained damage in the July 30 flood and the Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval to make structural repairs/alterations to the building. This building spans the Tiber River and the basement foundation wall also serves as the stream retaining wall. The work currently proposed is interior work and does not require a Certificate of Approval. However, the work is structural and is eligible for the Historic Property Tax Credit program and does require tax credit pre-approval. The proposed work is:

“Remove 1,000 square feet of framed interior flooring, closed cell foam insulation and damaged floor joists. Install new steel beams and corrugated structural panels for new concrete decking. Finish flooring of concrete appropriately and cure and seal. Install closed cell foam insulation to underside.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

**Staff Comments:** This building has been affected by many floods over the years. The entire storefront was replaced after Tropical Storm Agnes in 1972. In recent years, the basement of this building has been repointed for tax credits due to flooding water from the Tiber River. The intent of this project is to provide a structural upgrade over the river using the steel and concrete system.

The proposed work is eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code, “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.” The new structural system will maintain the physical integrity of the structure, making a safer structure that will be able to withstand any future weather events. The installation of insulation is not eligible for the tax credits, nor is any extra aesthetic finishing treatments to the concrete decking/flooring, beyond treatments required for basic installation of the structural system.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the removal of the existing flooring and installation of steel and concrete decking system, with the exclusion of the installation of insulation and possible aesthetic treatments to the concrete floor.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Len Berkowitz and asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments application. Mr. Berkowitz said no, but explained that he has read the report done by the Structural Engineer and believes they are qualified to produce the proposal and improve the quality of the building. Ms. Zoren said a vapor barrier would preserve the structure since the building is over water. Mr. Berkowitz said it would be a replacement in-kind since there was five inches of R21 insulation underneath the building but all washed away during July’s flood. Mr. Reich said the application stated “Closed Cell Foam” which is a vapor barrier. Mr. Berkowitz said in 2011 there was 18 inches of insulation and plywood under the building and all of that washed away during the flood that year. Ms. Zoren said the vapor barrier would protect the building from moisture. She explained that it would also protect moisture from seeping into steel and concrete materials. Mr. Berkowitz said the spray closed cell foam will be sprayed on the steel panes which are welded together and painted in a highly coated super bonded paint. Mr. Bennett asked what the existing beams are sitting on. Mr. Berkowitz said all three are sitting on granite blocks that support the building on each side of the river and they go all the way through the front of the building. Mr. Reich asked would the contractors have to take out all the wood beams to install the steel beams. Mr. Berkowitz said no, the steel beams will be left there then welding horizontally across.



**Motion:** Mr. Tennor moved to approve application as submitted with tax credit pre-approval for removal of existing flooring and installation of steel and concrete decking system and including the cost of insulation. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**16-105 – Parking Lot E, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval to repair wall.

Applicant: Mark DeLuca, Howard County Department of Public Works

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District on Court Avenue. A portion of the retaining wall in Lot E collapsed after the rain event on July 30. The Applicant proposes to repair the wall with an imbricated wall as shown below in Figure 29 and 30. The stone will be sourced from a quarry in Butler, Maryland.



**Figure 28 - Collapsed wall temporarily stabilized with rip rap**



**Figure 29 - North East corner rendering of proposed imbricated wall**



**Figure 30 - North east corner rendering of proposed imbricated wall**

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The proposed stone will be very similar in size, shape and color to the historic granite wall that collapsed. There is an existing historic wall adjacent to the collapsed wall

and the new stone will tie in well to the existing historic stone wall and not stand out as a modern repair.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Mark DeLuca. Mr. Shad asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments application. Mr. DeLuca said no, but explained the existing stone shown in Figure 28 is repair stone that will be removed. He said that the wall will be replaced with an imbricated wall, which is stacked stone shown in Figure 29 and 30, and it will be tied in to the failed wall. Mr. DeLuca explained that the section of the wall still standing shown in the left of Figure 28 is composed of different masonry units, so the durability is all different. He said that this section of the wall is more susceptible to more failures, but it could last a month or years, so it will remain as-is now.

Mr. DeLuca said the stone will be from a quarry in Butler, Maryland. Mr. DeLuca said this stone was used for the wall in front of La Palapa's and the County's Department of Public Works repaired a wall at the B&O Museum with it as well. He said the proposed stone is not granite, it is called a schist stone, and is a very durable rock. Mr. DeLuca said it will also be used for the Wall between Parking Lots E & F and explained that it won't be an exact match because granite is different from schist and finding granite to match is difficult. Mr. Tennor asked if the stone will wear and show the red color that is seen in the core of the stone. Mr. DeLuca said no, and explained that the red is iron and most of rock is gray it all depends on the vein. He said it will mostly look grey with red streaks. Mr. Reich asked if the stone will be the size of boulders. Mr. DeLuca said yes, they are very large pieces. Ms. Tennor asked if the gap in between the stones will be as large as shown on the rendering. Mr. DeLuca said it will be fairly tight and the mason will fit them. Ms. Zoren asked if there will be any plantings in the area. Mr. DeLuca said it could be planted.

**Motion:** Mr. Reich moved to approve the application per Staff recommendations. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS**

Mr. Shad proposed to cancel January 2017 meeting.. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Shad moved to adjourned. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 9:23pm.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Allan Shad, Chair

---

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

---

Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner

---

Yvette Zhou, Recording Secretary